

**THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION BOARD HELD ON
SEPTEMBER 16, 2013, AT 7:00 P.M., AT THE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M., by Jack Edmonds. Members present were Tim Siercks, Dick Dobson, Mitzi Mellott, and Jim Kusler (Princeton Twsp. Representative). Staff present were Carie Fuhrman and Mary Lou DeWitt.

Absent was Chad Heitschmidt.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING ON AUGUST 19, 2013

DOBSON MOVED, SECOND BY SIERCKS, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 19, 2013. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS: None

PUBLIC HEARING:

A. #11-13 Preliminary Plat for Sharco Second Addition

John Peterson, on behalf of Great Northern Land, has submitted a Preliminary Plat application for Sharco Second Addition. The plat involves the creation of eight (8) single family home lots on the property currently described as Outlot E, Sharco Estates, which encompasses approximately 4.66 acres.

The Planning Commission recently issued a variance to the Airport Zoning Ordinance that limited the density on this piece of property in order for it to be developed into single family homes. The applicant is now coming forward with the Preliminary Plat application.

Sharco Second Addition proposes Lots 1-8 and Outlot A, Block 1, on what is currently known as Outlot E, Sharco Estates, which is located on the northwest corner of Meadow View Drive and 14th Avenue South in Princeton. The proposal is for eight single family home lots, ranging in size from 13,137 square feet to 31,170 square feet. The property is zoned R-2 Residential and planned for Mixed Residential on the Future Land Use Plan.

The subdivision does not meet the requirements for a Short Plat by our Subdivision Ordinance standards, so it must follow the Preliminary and Final Plat procedures.

Mike Nielson, City Engineer with WSB Engineering, has reviewed the submitted plans and prepared a memo, dated August 29, 2013, that reads:

I have reviewed the preliminary plat application plans submitted by Anderson Passé & Associates dated 8-26-13 and signed by Brent Roshell, PE. The plans included Sheets 1-4.

The proposed plat includes Lots 1-8 and Outlot A. Lots 1-8 are designated as single family split entry homes with low floor elevations ranging from 977.0 to 977.50.

The previously approved plan for Sharco Estates identifies the ground water elevation at 989.00 and the back to back 100 year storm pond elevation at 973.8. The low floor elevation of 977.0 exceeds the minimum required separation.

Clarification is needed on the drainage for the backyards for Lots 1-8. The plan currently shows drainage from Lot 5-7 going to the west towards the pond through Lot 8. Also, the drainage from Lots 1-3 drains through the back yard of Lots 5-8. Some clarification of drainage needs to be provided. Drainage easements should be provided to insure future drainage for all lots.

Also clarification of the EOF identified at 977.96 should be provided. The low building opening should be specified to insure that water does not back up into the windows of the split entry home lots. Two feet of freeboard should be provided for the back to back 100 year flood. It appears that they will be ok, but some indication of the Low Opening should be provided on the plan.

Drainage calculations have not been provided for any of the development. Calculation must be provided for all rear yard drainage and front yard drainage to the street including spread and run by calculations for all drainage to the street and storm sewer systems.

Fuhrman informed the Planning Commission Board that there was a Developer's meeting on July 17, 2013, where City Staff and Mr. Peterson and his Engineer met to discuss the proposed plat. The trail shall be reconfigured to connect with the sidewalk on the south side of Meadow View Drive in order to provide better pedestrian access. Staff is suggesting this be the responsibility of the Developer.

The Princeton Public Utilities staff has reviewed the preliminary plat. It is believed that three lots (Lot 5,7, and 8) need to be wet tapped and curb stops installed. Electricity will have to be run into the plat. The PUC has suggested that the sewer get stubbed in prior to the electricity.

The minimum lot area is 9,800 square feet for one family lot, and the minimum lot width is 66 feet; both requirements are met with the proposed lots. A Landscaping Plan is required to be submitted. Although, the applicant is not proposing to construct homes at this time, it is important that the Developer's Agreement address the landscaping requirements for future builders.

- Each one family residential dwelling unit shall contain trees totaling at least 8 inches in diameter at installation with a minimum of two trees located in front of the home. Each tree must meet minimum size requirements as listed in the Ordinance.
- Landscaping shall provide for an appropriate mix of plantings around a minimum of 50% of the exterior foot print of all buildings.
- All open area of any site not occupied shall be sodded or seeded.
- Remainder of the provisions of Chapter VI.L. shall be followed.

Additional data is required to be provided on the preliminary plat drawings:

- Minimum front and side building setback lines with dimensions.
- The Subdivision Ordinance requires that in any area where lots are platted in excess of 24,000 square feet, a preliminary re-subdivision plan is required showing a potential and feasible way in which the lots may be re-subdivided in future years for more intensive use of the land. In addition, the placement of buildings or structures upon such lots shall allow for potential re-subdivision.

Comment: Lots 5-8 are fairly large in size. The Developer and City staff have reviewed various other options for the layout of the lots, but without putting a new road in, a new configuration would be difficult.

Property owners to the north of the alley have approached the Developer with interest in purchasing a portion of the northern parts of Lots 5-8 to “add” as additional yard to their properties, but the property owners have not followed up with the Developer, and so he is proceeding as originally planned. If this were to proceed, the preliminary plat would need to come back in front of the Planning Commission for another public hearing.

- The applicant had indicated a potential for increasing the depth of Lots 1 and 2, which would decrease the size of Lots 5 and 6 potentially.

Other Regulations: The proposed homes and accessory buildings shall meet all regulations, including setbacks, height, type, minimum floor area, parking, driveway, etc. This shall be addressed in the Developer’s Agreement. The Building Inspector has asked for clarification as to whether the proposed homes are look-outs or walk-outs.

As a part of the Final Plat requirements, the applicant shall be responsible for following the final plat procedures identified in the Subdivision Ordinance, including the requirement to enter into a Developer’s Agreement, obtaining appropriate signatures, submittal of three Mylar’s (two copies for the County; one for the City records). The City Attorney has begun reviewing the Title Work.

If at the time the builder is requesting a Certificate of Occupancy, and the landscaping and driveways are not finished, a \$3,000 escrow shall be required to be submitted.

The Princeton Park Board met and recommended acceptance of the park dedication fee in an amount of \$4,880, versus park land to meet the park dedication requirements. The City Council shall make the final determination.

As the plans indicate, Outlot A contains a trail that was constructed some years back. It is unclear if an easement was obtained for this trail. This issue will need to be cleared up whether the City obtains ownership of Outlot A, or an easement is obtained. This has been discussed with the Developer.

The City is in the process obtaining the majority of the large drainage pond that serves Meadow View and Sharco Estates after the parcel went into tax forfeiture (Outlot D, Sharco Estates). Outlot A, Meadow View Fifth Addition (just south of Outlot D) is currently coded tax exempt, and the Developer has verbally agreed to transferring the ownership of Outlot A, Meadow View Fifth Addition to the City as a part of this project. This will ensure that the majority of the pond is in the City’s hands as they are already maintaining the pond and is not available for future redevelopment. This shall also be addressed between the applicant and City.

Fuhrman said if the recommended conditions are met, the Preliminary Plat appears to meet the

Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance standards; she recommends to the Planning Commission to recommend approval to the City Council of the Preliminary Plat, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Applicant shall address the City Engineer's comments outlined in the memo dated August 29, 2013.
- 2) The trail shall be reconfigured to connect with the sidewalk on the south side of Meadow View Drive in order to provide better pedestrian access. This shall be shown on the Preliminary Plat.
- 3) Applicant shall address the Princeton Public Utilities comments.
- 4) Landscape Plan shall be submitted prior to Final Plat review.
- 5) Plans shall clarify if the proposed homes are look-outs or walk-outs.
- 6) Additional required data shall be added to the Preliminary Plat drawings (setbacks, re-subdivision plan, etc.)
- 7) Applicant shall meet the park dedication requirements.
- 8) Applicant shall be responsible for following the final plat procedures identified in the Subdivision Ordinance.
- 9) Applicant shall enter into a Developer's Agreement with the City.

Mike Nielson, City Engineer with WSB Engineering addressed the Planning Commission Board. The drainage calculations are needed to determine where the water from Lots 1-4 will run off. We do not want run off to Lot 5 where it creates standing water.

Fuhrman introduced Greg Peterson, the son of John Peterson and he will be filling in for his father tonight and answer questions.

Edmonds asked what the Building Inspector was asking for.

Fuhrman said the Building Inspector has asked that the plat be clear on what they are building, look-outs or walk-outs for the type of homes.

Nielson said the grading plans will show that they will not be walk-outs.

Greg Peterson confirmed that they will not be walk-outs, but look-outs would be nice. They have to see what the calculations are.

Edmonds opened the public hearing. There were no questions from those present in the audience.

DOBSON MOVED, SECOND BY SIERCKS, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

Dobson asked Greg Peterson if he had a problem with any conditions that were listed.

Greg Peterson said no.

Edmonds said John Peterson had a public meeting for the neighbors to attend and review what is intended to be built and ask questions. Approximately six to eight people came. A few of the property owners had asked if it was possible to buy some of the area on the back lots that would give their land a little larger area. Did they contact the Developer further on this.

Greg Peterson said no, there has been no further contact from them.

Fuhrman said an alley is between those lots and the proposed development and they would need to meet the alley to the lots. She believes it is a dedicated right-of-way. It would have to be replated if some of the neighbors bought a section of the property. The Park Board reviewed the Developer's proposal to give park land instead of the park dedication fee and the Park Board decided to take the park dedication fee. They do not want more park land.

Edmonds asked if Outlot A is dedicated back to the City, would the Park Board be responsible to take care of it.

Fuhrman said that currently the City is taking care of it. Public Works has been mowing it. Maybe a bench or something could be added to the area in the future.

MELLOTT MOVED, SECOND BY DOBSON, TO APPROVE ITEM #11-13 PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR SHARCO SECOND ADDITION AND FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR RECOMMENDED APPROVAL WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1) APPLICANT SHALL ADDRESS THE CITY ENGINEER'S COMMENTS OUTLINED IN THE MEMO DATED AUGUST 29, 2013.
- 2) THE TRAIL SHALL BE RECONFIGURED TO CONNECT WITH THE SIDEWALK ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF MEADOW VIEW DRIVE IN ORDER TO PROVIDE BETTER PEDESTRIAN ACCESS. THIS SHALL BE SHOWN ON THE PRELIMINARY PLAT.
- 3) APPLICANT SHALL ADDRESS THE PRINCETON PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMENTS.
- 4) LANDSCAPE PLAN SHALL BE SUBMITTED PRIOR TO FINAL PLAT REVIEW.
- 5) PLANS SHALL CLARIFY IF THE PROPOSED HOMES ARE LOOK-OUTS OR WALK-OUTS.
- 6) ADDITIONAL REQUIRED DATA SHALL BE ADDED TO THE PRELIMINARY PLAT DRAWINGS (SETBACKS, RE-SUBDIVISION PLAN, ETC.)
- 7) APPLICANT SHALL MEET THE PARK DEDICATION REQUIREMENTS.

8) APPLICANT SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR FOLLOWING THE FINAL PLAT PROCEDURES IDENTIFIED IN THE SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE.

9) APPLICANT SHALL ENTER INTO A DEVELOPER'S AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY.

UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

A. Review of Sign Regulations

Fuhrman informed the Planning Commission Board that there have recently been some questions raised regarding particulars of the City's sign regulations. It is healthy to review Zoning Ordinance provisions on a regular basis, and so staff is requesting the Planning Commission's discussion regarding the following items:

- A) Roof Signs
- B) Wall Mounted Business Signs
- C) Temporary Signs
- D) Signs Perpendicular to buildings (Banner perpendicular to walls or sign below awning/roof overhang)
- E) Electronic Sign

Fuhrman said each item could be discussed one at a time or if the Planning Commission would rather have a work session setup, she could arrange that.

The Planning Commission Board decided to discuss the sign items one at a time.

Roof Signs:

The Sign Ordinance defines a roof sign as any sign erected over or on the roof of a building, but the Ordinance does not place any regulations on them (number, placement, height, etc).

Comment: Of a similar nature, the Sign Ordinance addresses canopy and awning sign, but does not allow the sign height to exceed the top of the parapet wall or eaves, which would essentially be a roof sign. Staff is requesting the Planning Commission's discussion regarding these signs for clarification for future requests. If the Planning Commission wants to allow these signs, Fuhrman would suggest placing regulations on the number, placement, height, etc.

Fuhrman said the former Liquor Store building that now is occupied by "Paws Up 4 You" would like to have a roof sign. A photo of what they would like to have for signage has been included in the Planning Commission packets.

Edmonds asked if the roof signs were ever spoken of at the sign meetings.

Fuhrman said no.

Edmonds does not mind them as a permitted use. Conditions on how they are lit or not lit would need to be address.

Siercks said the size of the sign also.

Dobson suggested it could be included in the wall signs for the size requirements.

Fuhrman said yes, than you would need to see if they both could be permitted on a building, a wall and roof.

Siercks said we could use the same language as for a wall sign.

Fuhrman said the wordage for snow would have to be addressed. In the north mall, there is a roof sign left from the old theatre and Crossing Church had used it when they were in the mall.

Edmonds commented that the roof sign request has three roof signs, would those three signs be totaled together for the sign size.

Fuhrman said yes, the Sign Ordinance allows one sign per tenant. There are multiple wall signs in the area, for example Walmart and Coborn's. If it meets the square footage she is okay with multiple signs as long as there is just a couple.

Mellott said her concern is safety where the roof sign is anchored in correctly.

Siercks commented that a final inspection process would be done where that should be checked.

Nielson said a review of the proposed roof signage by an architect or engineer would be a good idea. Wind loading not the dead load needs to be looked at.

Fuhrman said a maximum height for roof signage would be a good idea where they cannot get taken with strong winds.

Nielson said there is a lot that building codes are for a certain reason and if someone gets injured because it came down from strong winds, the City could be liable. The City is maintaining the codes.

Siercks said how long would it be a liability when time goes by and the sign is deteriorating and not as strong. What about wall signs being approved by an architect.

Neilson said the wall can withstand the wind and weight of snow. If the City does not have an architect or engineer looking over the roof signs then he recommends not allowing them.

Siercks said a roof sign should have the same requirements as a wall sign.

Dobson disagrees on that.

Nielson said the hangers on the wall sign should be okay, not as many forces working on a wall sign. A roof sign should have an architect or engineer reviewing it.

Edmonds agrees, but it is the cost to the applicant to have it reviewed.

Mellott commented that if the person wanting a roof sign wants it they would be comfortable paying the review fee. If not having the review by the architect or engineer she is not comfortable allowing them.

Nielson said health and safety is the issue.

Mellott said more regulations to have them reviewed should not be an issue. She is not big on over regulations, but something like a sign coming off the roof should be reviewed.

Dobson said there is more stress from the elements to a roof sign than a wall sign.

Fuhrman said she could do research on roof signs and bring it back to the next Planning Commission meeting. She will also ask the Building Inspector for his opinion on roof signs and have that included with what she finds out.

Edmonds asked that she look into what the cost would be if they were reviewed by an architect or engineer.

Siercks said if we can keep restricting signage, businesses will not be coming here. Every type of signage will have a different scenario.

Nielson said that is 100% correct that each type of roof sign would be a different scenario and that is why an engineer or architect should review them. The wall signs are engineered and have manufacturing recommendations. A roof design cannot have manufacturing designs. They cannot know all the roof designs out there. He does not see the need for wall signs to be reviewed by an engineer or architect. The square footage on the roof signs is what would determine if it needs to be reviewed by the engineer or architect.

Fuhrman will look into a certain square footage of a roof sign and she can go over this with Nielson and the City Building Inspector on if a certain sign size would be okay, and if over a certain size would need engineer reviews.

Wall Mounted Business Signs:

The Sign Ordinance only allows one wall sign for each principal building (except if the building fronts two or more streets, then more are allowed). The gross surface of a wall sign cannot exceed 10% of the building wall, or 200 square foot, whichever is smaller.

Multi-tenant buildings are allowed one wall sign per tenant, meeting the above size requirements. For buildings that are allowed multiple wall signs, the Zoning Administrator can allow individual wall signs larger than 200 square foot in exchange for reducing or removing other wall signage normally allowed.

Comment:

There are several examples of businesses within city limits with multiple wall signs. Whether they were interpreted as having multiple tenants, did not receive a permit prior to placing the signs, or have been in place prior to this sign regulation. Fuhrman is requesting the Planning Commission discussion regarding these signs and interpretation of this Ordinance.

Dobson said look at what the League of MN Cities has for sign information. They put out a brochure a few years back that was very informational. The City Attorney should review what is put together also.

Temporary Signs:

The City adopted regulations for temporary signs back in 2011.

Comment: The regulations do not allow for profit businesses to place temporary signs off-site, but do allow non-profit organizations and government units to do so. The Ordinance limits the number of permits that can be issued on any one property per calendar year and does not allow more than one temporary sign on any one property at one time. Fuhrman is requesting the Planning Commission's discussion regarding these requirements.

Dobson said he believes the temporary sign regulations look good.

Fuhrman commented that for profit businesses off-site signs are not allowed. Non-profit organizations can put off-site signs with the permission of the property owner.

Dobson said non-profits should be allowed to put them off-site.

Siercks disagrees, it is the profit ones that are paying taxes. No off-site signs should be allowed for profit or non-profit. Aren't they worried that this sign could be blown away.

Edmonds moved the discussion to electronic signs.

Electronic Signs:

The Sign Ordinance does not regulate electronic signage. Fuhrman provided photos of current electronic signage that Princeton has now.

Comment: Several months ago, a subcommittee was formed to evaluate digital signs

(ex: electronic readerboard, video display boards, etc) as they are not addressed in the City's Sign Ordinance. The subcommittee's recommendation is to not allow these types of signs within the majority of the B-1 Central Business District and B-2 Neighborhood Business District, except the B-2 District south of 6th Street, and to allow them in the other Commercial and Industrial Districts. This is in an effort to protect the residential neighborhoods and historic nature of downtown.

Fuhrman is requesting that the Planning Commission review signs of this nature. If the Planning Commission were to move forward with any changes to the Ordinance, Fuhrman would suggest getting an opinion from the Downtown Committee (recently formed from the Princeton Chamber) as to their thoughts on this proposal. The existing signs that do not meet this provision would be allowed to continue with limited maintenance allowed.

Some other points addressed by the subcommittee include:

- Requiring review by the Planning Commission of any digital sign
- Limiting the illumination; establishing brightness standards
- Limiting the number of times an electronic message can change (safety reasons)
- Backlit signs would not be affected

Edmonds said a sign company selling a sign should have their own research on changes for the sign graphics.

Fuhrman said the sign company would recommend ideas for the sign resolution, and viewing the sign from the roadway when you are traveling a certain miles per hour speed.

Siercks said he likes that limiting where this type of sign can be has been addressed.

Fuhrman said that she would like to keep the current signs that are in place to be able to be updated. Such as the Bremmer Bank and Holiday signs. Would the Planning Commission like Fuhrman to get the Chamber and Downtown Committees thoughts on the signage proposal.

Dobson and Edmonds thought that would be a good idea.

Dobson said to look at what the City of Red Wing has in place for their signage downtown. It looks very pleasing. Dobson would like Fuhrman to look at all five of the signage items and bring it back to the Planning Commission.

Fuhrman will look at the structural mounting of wall signs that hang out from the wall area. The temporary signage she will leave the wordage that non-profit are allowed to place the temporary signs off-site, and for-profit businesses they can be placed only on site. Fuhrman will take the electronic signs proposal to the Chamber and Downtown Committee for their recommendation.

COMMUNICATION AND REPORTS:

A. Verbal Report

1) Fence Regulations Update

Fuhrman said she is still working on the fence permit guidelines and will have more on this at the next meeting. She found out Cambridge does not require a fence permit if the fence is below six feet in height.

2) Princeton Speedway Review after Season Finish

Fuhrman said there were conditions placed with the Conditional Use Permit on the race schedule and it will come forward for review to the October 21st Planning Commission meeting. If the Planning Commission were to want to make changes to the conditions then a public hearing would be needed. Does the Planning Commission want to review the Conditional Use Permit or do they believe changes need to be made to the conditions where a public hearing needs to be called.

Dobson said they have done an excellent job at getting the races done on time and rain dates were really not an issue. No makeup dates were needed.

Siercks said there was one complaint.

Edmonds said just review it, no public hearing is needed.

Fuhrman said Siercks had inquired about a practice date and one of the conditions was “No more than two races per season may be regularly scheduled for non-Friday dates”. She had given the okay and hopes the Planning Commission is okay with that.

The Planning Commission Board agreed that was fine.

B. City Council Minutes for August, 2013

The Planning Commission Board had no comments.

DOBSON MOVED, SECOND BY SIERCKS, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:32 P.M.

ATTEST:

Jack Edmonds, Chairperson

Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Assistant